The teaching of Allen at column 10, lines 11-23 is acknowledged. However, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner reads far too much into that teaching. Read in context, the "many electrochemical cells" which are contemplated there by Allen also include those with a caustic electrolyte and those used in a chlor-alkali cell, all of which are conventional electrochemical cells with a liquid electrolyte. Thus, "other" is explained as relating to other liquid electrolyte cells.

Further, there is nothing in this record to support the examiner's contention that the catalyst sites in Koschany would be subject to the flooding problem to which the teachings of Allen et al are directed.

The teaching at column 5, lines 45-57 referred to by the examiner is also acknowledged. The advantages of electric resistivity, etc., to which the examiner refers are described by Allen et al at column 5, lines 45-57 as being advantages over a specific prior art electrode structure, i.e., a "teflon-coated hydrophobic paper substrate." In other words the "lower electric resistivity" discussed by Allen et al is described only as "lower" relative to a "teflon-coated hydrophobic paper substrate." While that teaching may be motivation for substituting the cloth-based electrode of Allen et al for the "teflon-coated paper substrate" of the prior art, it has no relevance to the bipolar plate anode and cathode of Koschany.

Finally, the teachings of Allen et al are regarded as leading away from, not toward the present invention for the reason given at page 10, lines 2-14 of applicants' previous response which the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider.

Respectfully submitted,

George A. Loud
Reg. No. 25,814

Dated: November 10, 2004

LORUSSO, LOUD & KELLY
3137 Mount Vernon Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22305

(703) 739-9393